

supporting a world ordered by law, and pursue instead a unilateralist path?

Or will we recommit our Nation to the achievement of workable democratic structures, to law and diplomacy, and to constructive leadership that produces coalitions to bring about just solutions?

There may be times, when all else fails, that unilateral American military action will be necessary, and Iraq may be a case in point. However, in my view, that has not been established. War must only be a last resort.

But the spirit of our foreign policy should not be the establishment of American hegemony, any more than we would want to see the establishment of al-Qaida's vision of a new radical fundamentalist Islamic world.

More importantly, I strongly believe that a foreign policy oriented towards cooperation and consultation will, in the long run, prove to be a more effective guarantor of U.S. national security than one of unilateralist impulse and confrontation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SEPTEMBER 11 COMMISSION

• Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, this past November, after extensive discussions, the Congress authorized the establishment of a commission to investigate the event surrounding the September 11 terrorist attacks. This commission should play a critically important role by allowing us to better understand the events surrounding this national tragedy and to better prepare against the threats of similar attacks in the future. The commission's work is also essential for the thousands of families who lost loved ones on September 11, and who want better information about what happened on that fateful day, and who want to ensure that all those responsible are held accountable. These families have suffered tremendous losses and they deserve our support.

I am very concerned, however, that the commission may lack the resources need to do the job right. So far, in defense appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2003, Congress has appropriated only \$3 million for the commission. From all indications, this is grossly inadequate. And if we fail to supplement this with additional funding, we would not only be disgracing the memory of the victims of September 11, but we could be jeopardizing the future safety of all Americans.

Mr. President, in recent days, my staff and I have discussed the operation of this important investigatory commission with several of the appointed commissioners, both Democrats and Republicans. They have explained that the \$3 million appropriated so far appears woefully insufficient to meet the commission's anticipated needs this fiscal year. In fact, actual needs for FY2003 probably will exceed \$6 million—more than twice the amount approved by the Congress.

Mr. President, the responsibilities of the September 11 commission are much broader than the other commissions and it is simply unreasonable to expect

the commission to function effectively with only \$3 million. After all, that's a \$2 million less than the funding received by a 1996 commission to look into the issues surrounding legalized gambling.

Think about that: \$5 million to study gambling, \$3 million to study the worst terrorist attack in the history of this country. That simply does not make sense.

Mr. President, it is important to remember that this commission has responsibilities and requirements that go far beyond those of any other commission in U.S. history. There are unique and expensive logistical requirements, including the hiring of expert staff with high-level security clearances. The commission must secure real estate appropriate for top secret discussions, and provide high-level security of its employees and its information systems.

In order to complete the work of this important commission thoroughly and on time, more resources will be needed during this fiscal year, and in the future.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that if the Congress considers a supplemental appropriations bill later this year, that legislation will include needed additional resources for the commission.

In fact, I had prepared an amendment to this bill to increase funding for the commission by \$3 million. However, after a conversation with Governor Tom Kean, chair of the commission, I have decided not to introduce my amendment at this time. Rather, I will wait until a formal budget is drawn up by the commission.

I want to assure my colleagues, however, that I will not stop fighting for increased funding for the commission until I am convinced that the September 11 commission has received the funding that it needs to investigate the worst attack on American soil in our history. This matter is simply too important to do anything less.●

MIKE EVANS

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of the most dedicated public servants and loyal staff members I have had the privilege to work with. Mike Evans has served me with deliberation, dedication, and distinction for 18 years and I, the people of Montana, the United States Senate, and our Nation are the better for it.

Mike began his career as my legislative assistant for tax policy in 1983. As many in this Chamber will recall, that was a time of great debate in the Finance Committee. We had passed a major tax cut in 1981. The following year, a soaring budget deficit was demanding attention. By the time Mike came on board, not only was the Finance Committee dealing with "revenue raisers," to use the language of the day, but tax simplification was the hottest topic on the Finance Committee's agenda. Mike guided me through

the controversies with his usual enthusiasm and attention to detail. In fact, he was so impressive that he soon became my legislative director, and expanded his responsibilities to include overseeing my work on the Agriculture and Environment and Public Works Committees.

Perhaps his most significant accomplishment during his time with the EPW Committee was seeing the Clean Air Act of 1990 through the legislative process and into law. I was chairman of the Environmental Pollution Subcommittee then and Mike was my right arm—and sometimes my eyes and ears, too!

Getting that bill through the EPW Committee, the Senate floor, and then conference with the House was an arduous task. But Mike was there all the way. Through the seemingly endless markups, through the backroom negotiations off the Senate floor, and through the midnight conferences with the House, Mike was always ready with the right arguments, the necessary supporting materials, and, most important, his sage advice. That bill was a significant advance in the protection of public health and the cleanup of our environment. Mike's contributions to the bill will be long remembered.

In 1991, the lure of the Preston Gates law firm proved too much and he returned to the firm from whence he came. But when I became chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee in 1993, I succeeded in luring him back into public service. Mike became my general counsel on the EPW Committee, integrally involved with the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act, the Superfund law, and the Endangered Species Act. We weren't always successful, but Mike provided the legal underpinnings of our efforts.

It is as a lawyer that Mike's true talents show through. He not only masters the statutory construction and case law on any point with ease—or at least so it seems to me—but he is renowned among the staff for his ability to footnote material. I recall on several occasions getting memos from him where there was not a word of the memo on a page. Rather, the page was filled with footnotes. I told him that I appreciated a good footnote or two as much as the next lawyer, but next time he should save them for our opponents.

Mike is respected and admired by his colleagues. He was always willing to spend time with other staff to review legal arguments, provide advice and direction, and sometimes just be a sounding board. I was told that Mike's stature among his peers increased beyond measure when he revealed to the other staff that when reading bill language, subclause two is pronounced "subclause two" and not, as was the apparent custom, "two little eye."

Mike's attention to detail was perhaps most apparent when it came to the rules. First, he updated the EPW Committee rules and religiously filed